



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20591
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,231	10/17/2001	Steve Anderson Platt	PLA13 P-300	5580

277 7590 12/11/2002

PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON
695 KENMOOR, S.E.
P O BOX 2567
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501

EXAMINER

WAKS, JOSEPH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/981,231

Applicant(s)

PLATT, STEVE ANDERSON

Examiner

Joseph Waks

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the housing as recited in claim 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 27, 28, 38 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Re claims 27, 28 and 39, the housing is not clearly identified in the specification.

Re claim 38, the limitation of at least two spars including at six spars is not supported by the specification and does not make sense.

4. **Claims 27, 28 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For the reasons indicated above one skilled in the art would not be able to make or use the invention.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. **Claims 4, 8, 16, 28, and 31-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, line 6, "the first upper column includes one of the first vertical strip portions" and line 9, "the second upper column includes one of the second vertical strip portions" is ambiguous, examiner suggest -- the first upper column includes another one of the first vertical strip portions-- and -- the second upper column includes another one of the second vertical strip portions--respectively.

In claim 8, lines 2-3, "a wind power generator" should be --said wind power generator --.

In claim 16, lines 2-3, "a wind power generator" should be --said wind power generator--.

In claim 28, line 4, "the hub" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 31, line 2, "the first rod" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 9, 10, 15, 17-19, 24, and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Abe (US 4,311,434)**.

Abe discloses invention as claimed: a tower 1, a vertical elevator including track 1a and a carriage 12, and a pivot ring in a form of a roller bearing 17, a winch 13, a cable 14 and a pulley (Re Figure 3), a plurality of air foils 5, and electric power generator (Re column 1, lines 5-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claim 1-7, 11-14, 20-23, 57-62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe** (US 4,311,434) in view of **Fergusson** (US 5,244,346).

Abe discloses a tower 1 having three vertical columns connected with braces, a fully assembled elevator to raise and lower a wind powered generator 2, 4, 5. However, **Abe** does not disclose the tower comprising a lower tower section and an upper tower section having the third column converging to the first and second columns.

Fergusson discloses in Figures 6 and 7 a portable wind machine having a portable tower comprising a lower tower section 223 and an upper tower section 225 for the purpose of providing a self containing system that is easy to transport and to install at site without the need of providing an additional crane or other hauling means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the tower as taught by **Abe** and to provide the tower comprising the lower tower section and the upper tower section as taught by **Douthit** for the purpose of

Art Unit: 2834

providing a self containing system that is easy to transport and to install at site without the need of providing an additional crane or other hauling means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the upper tower section having the third column converging to the first and second columns for the purpose of accommodating various horizontally extending parts of the generator and to minimize the bending momentum on the tower, since applicant has not disclosed that the converged column solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with three parallel vertical columns.

It would have further been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the at least three cross braces in the lower column for the purpose of providing sturdy and rigid support for the generator, since applicant has not disclosed that the particular number of the three cross brace solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with four or other calculated number of braces.

11. **Claims 8, 16, 25 and 63** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Douthit (US 6,239,507)**.

Abe discloses the tower essentially as claimed. However, **Abe** does not disclose the carriage including the plurality of contacts contacting the rotating portion of the wind power generator.

Douthit discloses a carriage 16 rotatably supporting a wind powered generator 10 and having a plurality of contacts 130, 132 contacting the rotating portion of the generator 140, 142

Art Unit: 2834

for the purpose of transferring the current from the generator to an external storage or transmission means while allowing unlimited and free rotation of the generation above a vertical axis.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the tower as taught by **Abe** and to provide the carriage including the plurality of contacts contacting the rotating portion of the wind power generator as taught by **Douthit** for the purpose of transferring the current from the generator to an external storage or transmission means while allowing unlimited and free rotation of the generation above a vertical axis.

12. **Claims 27 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe** (US 4,311,434) in view of **Ellwood, 2d** (US 2,052,454).

Abe discloses the tower essentially as claimed. However, **Abe** does not disclose a rod rotating within a housing and at least two spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod and each having an airfoil connected thereon.

Ellwood, 2d discloses the wind powered generator (Re page 1, lines 27-29) having a rotating rod A and spars 16, 17, 18 connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil 21 connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the tower as taught by **Abe** and to provide the rotating rod and the spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil connected thereon

for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

Re claim 28, the combined system include the cam member shown by **Ellwood, 2d** as element 23 and the cam surface 32 engaging the cam member to rotate the airfoils relatively to the spars as the airfoils move along the spars. However, it does not disclose the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub for an easy access to the pitch adjustment mechanism without taking the blade out of the spar, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular arrangement of the cam member solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the cam member adjacent the hub.

6. **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)**.

Abe discloses the airfoil and generator including a vertical leg 10 to rotate the generator relatively the carriage. However, **Abe** does not disclose the leg rotating relatively to the carriage.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the leg rotating relatively to the carriage for the purpose of eliminating an oversized bearing and replace it with a shaft diameter sized bearing, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

13. **Claims 30, 44, 45, 50, 52** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Deering (US 5,584,655)**.

The combined tower disclosed the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator.

Deering discloses in Figure 2 the wind powered generator having the horizontal leg including first shaft 202 and a second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils 104a and 104 b and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg 210 and the generator for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis 206.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator as taught by **Deering** for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis while allowing the foil and shaft rotation over the horizontal axis and consequently to turn the electric generator.

14. **Claims 31-33, 53-56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Deering (US 5,584,655)** and further in view of **Ellwood, 2d (US 2,052,454)**.

The combined tower discloses the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose a rod rotating within a housing and at least two spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod and each having an airfoil connected thereon.

Ellwood, 2d discloses the wind powered generator (Re page 1, lines 27-29) having a rotating rod A and spars 16, 17, 18 connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil 21 connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the rotating rod and the spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

Re claim 33, the combined system include the cam member shown by **Ellwood, 2d** as element 23 and the cam surface 32 engaging the cam member to rotate the airfoils relatively to the spars as the airfoils move along the spars. However, it does not disclose the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub for an easy access to the pitch adjustment mechanism without taking the blade out of the spar, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular arrangement of the cam member solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the cam member adjacent the hub.

15. **Claims 34 and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ellwood, 2d** (US 2,052,454).

Art Unit: 2834

Ellwood, 2d discloses the wind powered generator (Re page 1, lines 27-29) having a rotating rod A and spars 16, 17, 18 connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil 21 connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the rotating rod and the spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

Ellwood, 2d discloses the cam member 23 and the cam surface 32 engaging the cam member to rotate the airfoils relatively to the spars as the airfoils move along the spars. However, **Ellwood, 2d** does not disclose the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub for an easy access to the pitch adjustment mechanism without taking the blade out of the spar, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular arrangement of the cam member solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the cam member adjacent the hub.

16. **Claims 35-37, 42, 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ellwood, 2d** (US 2,052,454) in view of **Deering** (US 5,584,655).

The combined tower discloses the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator.

Deering discloses in Figure 2 the wind powered generator having the horizontal leg including first shaft 202 and a second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils 104a and 104 b and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg 210 and the generator for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis 206.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator as taught by **Deering** for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis while allowing the foil and shaft rotation over the horizontal axis and consequently to turn the electric generator.

17. **Claims 39-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ellwood, 2d** (US 2,052,454).

Ellwood, 2d discloses the rotating rod member A, spars 17 connected to the rod, airfoils 21 connected to the spars cam member 23 and the cam surface 32 engaging the cam member to rotate the airfoils relatively to the spars as the airfoils move along the spars. However, **Ellwood, 2d** does not disclose six spars configuration.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide six spars for the purpose of optimizing the number of blades versus the height of the system of the desirable power output, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular arrangement of the spars and blades solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the three or other number of spars, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

The electrical generator is inherent to any wind powered electric plant.

18. **Claim 51** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe** (US 4,311,434) in view of **Deering** (US 5,584,655) as applied to claim 44 above and further in view of **Douthit** (US 6,239,507).

The combined tower discloses the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose the carriage including the plurality of contacts contacting the rotating portion of the wind power generator.

Douthit discloses a carriage 16 rotatably supporting a wind powered generator 10 and having a plurality of contacts 130, 132 contacting the rotating portion of the generator 140, 142 for the purpose of transferring the current from the generator to an external storage or transmission means while allowing unlimited and free rotation of the generation above a vertical axis.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the tower as taught by **Abe** and to provide the carriage including the plurality of contacts contacting the rotating portion of the wind power generator as taught by

Douthit for the purpose of transferring the current from the generator to an external storage or transmission means while allowing unlimited and free rotation of the generation above a vertical axis.

19. **Claims 46-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Deering (US 5,584,655)** as applied to claim 44 above and further in view of **Fergusson (US 5,244,346)**.

Abe discloses a tower 1 having three vertical columns connected with braces, a fully assembled elevator to raise and lower a wind powered generator 2, 4, 5. However, **Abe** does not disclose the tower comprising a lower tower section and an upper tower section having the third column converging to the first and second columns.

Fergusson discloses in Figures 6 and 7 a portable wind machine having a portable tower comprising a lower tower section 223 and an upper tower section 225 for the purpose of providing a self containing system that is easy to transport and to install at site without the need of providing an additional crane or other hauling means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the tower as taught by **Abe** and to provide the tower comprising the lower tower section and the upper tower section as taught by **Douthit** for the purpose of providing a self containing system that is easy to transport and to install at site without the need of providing an additional crane or other hauling means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the upper tower section having the third column converging to the first and second columns for the purpose of accommodating

Art Unit: 2834

various horizontally extending parts of the generator and to minimize the bending momentum on the tower, since applicant has not disclosed that the converged column solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with three parallel vertical columns.

It would have further been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the at least three cross braces in the lower column for the purpose of providing sturdy and rigid support for the generator, since applicant has not disclosed that the particular number of the three cross brace solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with four or other calculated number of braces.

20. **Claim 64-66** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Douthit (US 6,239,507)** as applied to claim 63 above and further in view of **Ellwood, 2d (US 2,052,454)**.

The combined tower discloses the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose a rod rotating within a housing and at least two spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod and each having an airfoil connected thereon.

Ellwood, 2d discloses the wind powered generator (Re page 1, lines 27-29) having a rotating rod A and spars 16, 17, 18 connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil 21 connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to provide the rotating rod and the spars connected to, and radially extending from the rod, each having an airfoil connected thereon for the purpose of providing a variable pitch foil automatically adjusted to the wind velocity to obtain near constant revolutions at variable wind velocity.

Re claim 33, the combined system include the cam member shown by **Ellwood, 2d** as element 23 and the cam surface 32 engaging the cam member to rotate the airfoils relatively to the spars as the airfoils move along the spars. However, it does not disclose the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the cam member adjacent the second end of the spar, opposite the hub for an easy access to the pitch adjustment mechanism without taking the blade out of the spar, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular arrangement of the cam member solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the cam member adjacent the hub.

21. **Claims 67-70** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abe (US 4,311,434)** in view of **Douthit (US 6,239,507)** and further in view of **Ellwood, 2d (US 2,052,454)** as applied to claim 63 above and furthermore in view of **Deering (US 5,584,655)**.

The combined tower discloses the structure essentially as claimed. However, it does not disclose the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator.

Deering discloses in Figure 2 the wind powered generator having the horizontal leg including first shaft 202 and a second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils 104a and 104 b and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg 210 and the generator for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis 206.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the combined tower and to the horizontal leg including first and second shaft with the first shaft being rotatable within the second shaft and being interconnected with the foils and the second shaft connected to the vertical leg and the generator as taught by **Deering** for the purpose of positioning the airfoils at a desired downstream configuration by rotating the generator about the vertical axis while allowing the foil and shaft rotation over the horizontal axis and consequently to turn the electric generator.

Prior Art

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Waks whose telephone number is (703) 308-1676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor R Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2834

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-1341 for regular communications and (703) 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



JOSEPH WAKS
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TC-2800

JW

November 22, 2002